



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/567,882

02/08/2006

Matthias Hoffmann

56817M521

2362

23363 7590 07/14/2011
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
PO BOX 7068
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER

DIAZ, THOMAS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3656

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/14/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10/567,882	08 February 2006	HOFFMANN ET AL.	56817M521

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
PO BOX 7068
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER

THOMAS DIAZ

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3656	20110711
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This is a correction to the Examiner's Answer to make sure that all rejections of the claims on appeal have been listed.

The following rejection has been added to Section 9 Grounds of Rejection:

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taubmann et al. (WO9951456A1; using USP 7051986 as a translation of the PCT reference for discussing the rejection) in view of Hendrick (USP 2128483) and further in view of Campbell et al. (USP 3812737), as applied to claim 34 above, and further in view of Muellich (USP 5893959).

Regarding claim 35, Taubmann et al. does disclose the use of laser welding to connect the parts of the housing and laser technology, as discussed above. However, Taubmann et al. is silent to the external housing parts (fig.4, 71a and b) being transparent and the internal housing parts (fig.4, 72a and b) being non-transparent. Muellich teaches the use of a transparent housing cover (fig.1, 8) and a non-transparent housing base (fig.1, 7) for allowing a laser beam to shine through the housing cover and create a weld with an inner surface of the housing base. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the housing parts taught by Taubmann et al. by making the external housing parts transparent and the internal housing parts non-transparent as taught by Muellich for the purpose of allowing the laser beam during laser welding to shine through the housing part and create a weld on the inner contact surfaces between the parts. Examiner notes that this would create a better weld than just welding the outside of these components.

In addition under Section (10) Response to Arguments the following has been added:

Regarding claim 35, Appellant argues that it is patentable since it depends on claim 1 and includes further limitations. However, as noted by the rejection of claims 1 and 35, the claims are not patentable.

/Thomas Diaz/
Examiner, Art Unit 3656

/JAMES PILKINGTON/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3656